



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# NISAN FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH IN GOSPEL AND TALMUD

## A STUDY IN JEWISH CAMOUFLAGE

MATTHEW A. POWER, S.J.  
Manchester, England

### I. SOME WEIRD EQUATIONS

Out of many scores of New Testament scholars who hold that *the* contradiction in the Gospels lies in the different dates assigned to the crucifixion, we shall mention two only, an Englishman and an American.

Sanday writes, "Here then we can only say there is a contradiction."<sup>1</sup> And Cone, "There is no question that there is here an irreconcilable contradiction between the Fourth Gospel and the others as to the day of Crucifixion."<sup>2</sup>

Briefly, we may put the alleged contradiction thus:

*Crucifixion day* { Friday, 14 Nisan, Passover-Eve. Fourth Gospel.  
Friday, 15 Nisan, Passover-Day. Synoptic.<sup>3</sup>

It will be seen at a glance that the sacred writers implicated are in harmony about the day of the week. A certain school of German critics would say that the contradiction is not "hebdomadal" but is both "menological" and "heortological." In plain English this means that the week-day is right, but the month-day and feast-day wrong. Even here there is some little conflict of opinion. For reasons impossible to fathom, the illustrious scholar, the late Bishop Westcott, leans to the belief that the crucifixion took place on a Thursday<sup>4</sup>—but let that pass.

<sup>1</sup> *Authorship of Fourth Gospel*, p. 206. "Non licet dicere auctor hujus libri non tenuit veritatem, sed aut codex mendosus est, aut interpres erravit, aut tu non intelligis."—St. Aug. *Contr. Faust*, lib. XI, c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel Criticism*, p. 234. "Illud imprimis scribentium observetur animo primam esse historiae legem ne quid falsi dicere audeat."—Cicero.

<sup>3</sup> The difficulty is keenly felt and left unsolved by St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.*, Pars III, Q. 46, art. 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Introd. Stud. Gosp.* (2d ed.), p. 320.

It is a great thing that the writers, said to be in contradiction, are right on a small point. It encourages us to hope that they who are right in small things may possibly be right in greater.

For it *is* a small point, this question of the week-day. Among the Jews, Friday has no specific name. It is the undistinguished sixth day of the week. In the Latin church it fares no better. It is merely *feria sexta* and never comes within measurable distance of the Sunday or *Dies Dominica*. The early Greek church made a strenuous and successful effort to exalt it long before the rise of Quartodecimanism in the East.<sup>1</sup> To this day the ecclesiastical Greek for Friday is *ἡ παρασκευή*. This does not imply that the Greeks were attempting to translate from the Hebrew any high-sounding title like "Preparation Day." No such form exists in Hebrew, biblical, Talmudic, or German.<sup>2</sup> All that the Greeks knew of the modest *cheruch* of the Jews was all that there was to be known. It was a day spent in making preparations, mostly of a culinary kind, for the *κύριον σάββατον* or "lordly Sabbath," and hence a day ill suited to be itself a great feast, burdened with the law of abstention from servile works. In early Christian days the Greeks made more of their favorite Friday because of the crucifixion, and the Latins more of their favorite Sunday because of the resurrection. The latter finally paid the former the compliment of taking over the holy name *ἡ παρασκευή* and applying it to one day and only one day in the liturgical year—the "Parasceve,"<sup>3</sup> our Good Friday.

As surely as St. John specifies by the only Greek word that lay to his hand<sup>4</sup> the week-day of the crucifixion, so the Synoptics, without giving it a name, refer to the same day, just as clearly as they assign the resurrection to the Hebrew "first day of the week,"

<sup>1</sup> *Infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Yiddish.

<sup>3</sup> The Greek definite article in "*the* Parasceve" must unfortunately drop out of the Latin. On the other hand the lack of the indefinite article in Greek is often sorely felt, especially in Gal. 1:67, where St. Paul is trying to show the antithesis between *a* Gospel and *the* Gospel. English has a great advantage here.

<sup>4</sup> *παρασκευή τοῦ πάσχα* . . . John 19:14. It is certain that a Passover *per se* had no day of preparation before it. Only the Sabbath had. *παρασκευή* is necessarily the day before the Sabbath, our Friday. The rest of the phrase shows that that particular Sabbath was a *Passover-Sabbath*.

our Sunday. That, we submit, is a point scored by the advocates of the chronological accuracy of the four Gospels.

But the contradiction between the month-days is said to be irremovable. The sigh of Ecclesiastes over "the talk that bores"<sup>1</sup> is not more audible than that of H. Holtzmann over the Jewish calendar which he calls "das grösste Vexirstück."<sup>2</sup> It is so much easier to say that there is a contradiction than to show by an appeal to a number of alleged contradictions in other calendars that there is probably none. *Camouflages* in the *chronotaxis* of the Old and New Testament meet us at every turn, but they have their counterpart in other documents, ancient and modern. The laborious research bestowed on the unveiling of the latter should not come to a stop when the obscurities of biblical dates demand the investigation of the historian, the astronomer, and the mathematician.

Appended are a few instances of time-antinomies which *prima facie* are contradictions, but on careful examination are found to be quite reconcilable. In view of these facts the plea for an arrest of judgment in the case of the four Gospels may be urged with growing force.

1. Gerasimus, patriarch of Jerusalem, was summoned to appear before the imperial court in the sixth week of Lent (κατὰ τὴν ἑκτὴν ἑβδομάδα). So Gregoras of Dodona.<sup>3</sup> The prelate was called in the fifth week (Passion week), not the sixth (Holy week). Solution of the "contradiction"—the Greek sixth week = the Latin fifth week.

2. Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, was appointed "the fourth day of the first week" of Lent (τῇ τετάρτῃ τῆς πρώτης ἑβδομάδος). So Georgius Cedrenus.<sup>4</sup> He was appointed on Ash Wednesday, *before* the first week of Lent. Solution of the "contradiction" as in the last case.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> οἱ λόγοι ἔγκοποι . . . . Eccles. 1:8.

<sup>2</sup> *Hand-Comm.*, etc., II, 24. The same calendar was nearly the despair of Wurm, who calls it "kunstreich, verwickelt und schwerfällig." *Astronomische Beyträge*, etc. *Pamphlets*, Royal Observatory, Edinburgh, Vol. 191.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Patriarch. Hieros.*

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. ab Exord. Mundi*, etc.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Allatius, *Dissert. de Dominicis Recent. Graec.*, p. 1411.

3. Some English historians give the date of the death of Queen Elizabeth as March 24, 1602; some Scots give March 24, 1603; some Italians, April 3, 1603. Solution of the "contradiction"—these dates are not conflicting, but are to be equated according to different "Styles."

4. The Declaration of Right awarding the throne of England to William and Mary is dated by some English writers as February 12, 1688, and by some Dutchmen as February 22, 1689. Solution of the "contradiction" as above.

5. John Ogilvie, Scottish Jesuit, was hanged by the Anglican Archbishop Spottiswoode in Glasgow, February 28, 1615. So Pitcairn, a good authority.<sup>1</sup> He suffered martyrdom on March 10, 1615. So the Jesuit archives, Rome. Solution of the "contradiction" as above.

6. The Empress Catherine II of Russia died November 9, 1796. So Russian authorities. She died October 28. So British writers. Solution of the "contradiction" to be found in the two "Styles," the Russian and the Gregorian.<sup>2</sup>

We now come to closer grips with the Jewish calendar.

7. The great antiquity of the marble monument now in the Lateran museum and known as the *Canon Hippolyti* has never been challenged. On one of the sides of the chair a calendar-table, still legible, yields results which the great chronologist Aegidius Bucherius<sup>3</sup> regarded as startling and inexplicable.

The carver of the Greek letter-numerals is dealing with certain years<sup>4</sup> in which the fourteenth moon has *two* menstrual signatures appended to it, thus:

$$\text{A fourteenth moon in certain years} = \begin{cases} \text{XII Kal. Apr.} \\ \text{XI Kal. Apr.} \end{cases}$$

<sup>1</sup> *Criminal Trials*.

<sup>2</sup> Not long since the Russian government promised to accept our Gregorian calendar. In the present crisis promises of the kind do not count.

<sup>3</sup> Gilles Bouchier, S.J., in *Canon Hipp.*; Migne, *P.G.*, X, 887 ff. As a profound student of chronology this author may rank with Petavius (Petaud), Wurm, and Anger. The place of these four has never been filled.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., A.D. 224, 232, 240, 256, 264, 272.

Two "Styles" are here distinctly visible on the right side of the bracket, and the following four equations are inevitable on the acceptance of the double notation:

- |                             |                          |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) XII Kal. Apr.           | = XI Kal. Apr.           |
| (2) 21st March <sup>1</sup> | = 22d March              |
| (3) 14th Nisan (14th moon)  | = 15th Nisan (15th moon) |
| (4) Passover-Eve            | = Passover-Day           |

The words "XII et XI Kal. Apr." occur frequently in the *Canon Hippolyti* in the column headed by Bucherius, "Dies Terminorum Paschaliū" or "Lunæ 14 Paschales."<sup>2</sup>

Bucherius tried hard to discover why Hippolytus "contrary to rule assigns a brace of days to the 14th paschal moon."<sup>3</sup>

With what he regarded as a purely Christian cycle before him, it never occurred to him that this fragment of double notation was anything but Christian.<sup>4</sup> Yet two things are certain about it: (a) It is non-Christian. No Christian cycle known to history has ever given the least indication of a double "Style" that assigns two distinct menstrual signatures to a given moon. (b) Waiving the question of the Babylonian origin of this device, the fragment in question is essentially Jewish. Nor is this to be wondered at. In the third century, when these ancient symbols were carved in Rome, that city was crowded with Jews, both converts and non-converts, whose known predilections for their own venerable calendar might easily find expression on the panels of this old monument.

In our own days it is not the vernal equinox<sup>5</sup> that is awarded a duplicate signature. It is Hesvan that is intercalated, but the principle is precisely the same, and the same result is achieved. The Friday is kept clear of the Passover, and the Sabbath takes that honored place. The displacement is effected by the double notation and nothing else can bring about the object in view.

More than a *caveat* against the reckless imputation of "contradictions" in the Gospels may be learned from these symbols in

<sup>1</sup> The vernal equinox.

<sup>2</sup> Buch., *op. cit.*, p. 890.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Bucherius lacked the esoteric knowledge of *Badhu*, but his acquaintance with the Jewish calendar as a whole was quite extraordinary. See his great work *De Doctrina Temporum* (Antwerp 1634), pp. 313-432.

<sup>5</sup> The vernal equinox plays a vital part in the Jewish calendar of all time. The Sanhedrin was summoned "ad considerandum an annus intercalatus sit propter æquinoctium vernale." Maimonides in *Tr. de Synedriis*; Surenhus., *Mish.*, IV, 209.

stone, which bear out the main contentions of the monograph, *Anglo-Jewish Calendar for Every Day in the Gospels*.<sup>1</sup>

In this study the following points would seem to have been proved, though some minor statements need revision:

1. *Prima facie* there is no such process in the Jewish calendar as the transference of the Passover from Friday to the Sabbath.
2. On close analysis of every Jewish calendar known to history this transference is secretly but most assuredly practiced.
3. If it is to be done scientifically, and not as clumsily as in the *Canon Hippolyti*, the foregoing transference must be effected and is effected by the intercalation of a day.<sup>2</sup>
4. The main object of the transference is to make a Friday-Passover impossible.
5. This object is attained by the cryptic application by the calendar-makers of the rule *Badhu*.<sup>3</sup>

Because of this Hebrew nonsense-word, there is undoubtedly a tendency to regard the reality which it represents as a sort of chronological joke. כָּדֵר is quite as serious as Grimm's Law and as mathematically demonstrable as the precession of the equinoxes.<sup>4</sup> The test of the real existence of the rule<sup>5</sup> and its all-prevailing operation is quite simple for all who will take the trouble to collate any standard Jewish calendar,<sup>6</sup> ancient or modern, with the colossal *Syzigien-Tafeln* of the Austrian v. Oppolzer. In lunar tables like the latter, the Passovers, both B.C. and A.D., are bound to fall at fairly frequent intervals on a Friday. In the professedly lunar calendar of the Jews this conjunction can never

<sup>1</sup> By the present writer, who has been informed by the publishers that it is out of print.

<sup>2</sup> With subsequent excision of a day to redress the balance. On intercalation see *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this paper *Badhu* is used to express the exclusion of Friday *only* from the honors of the Passover. Nowadays other week days are similarly treated.

<sup>4</sup> Defined in a schoolboy "howler" as "a long procession of monsters with horses' heads on, in the night."

<sup>5</sup> There is no rubric *Badhu* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, nor *Tetragrammaton*, nor *Karaites*, a famous sect among the Jews—"the Protestants of Judaism" (Hosmer).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Lindo, *Jewish Calendar*; Schwarz, *Der jüd. Kal.*; *Kal für Israelit.* (Vienna); Jacobs, *Year Book* (London); Publications of Hebrew Publishing Co., New York.

be. In other words, the non-lunar factor of *Badhu*, which in its working is as dead a secret to the masses of the Jews as to Christians, has been surreptitiously introduced by the "wise" who sit *in camera*, and plays the rôle of a disturbing agent competing with and ousting the moon.

The relation of *Badhu* to the double reckoning of the Jewish calendar, and the power of the rule to solve the "contradiction" in the Gospels as to the date of the crucifixion, may or may not be a modern discovery of a revolutionary character, but the existence of the process is age-long,<sup>1</sup> and its dislocating influence on what is, at best, only a quasi-lunar calendar might have been demonstrated long since but for the disinclination of students to scale the ring-fence studiously erected by the professional framers of Jewish tables to guard the secret of their sacred calendar. "Ihr Kalender war ein Theil ihrer Religion";<sup>2</sup> yet that religion was no secret. Grätz has some preposterous remarks on the revelation of "the secret of the Calendar" by Hillel II.<sup>3</sup> The anti-lunar "dodge" that leads to the disqualification of the Friday as a Passover has never been avowed by Jewish authorities, and the secret of transference continues to be well kept up to the publication of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, inclusive.

It is this ingenious, tricky, and occult rule *Badhu* that makes it possible, as explained above, to write the equation, 14 Nisan = 15 Nisan. It may be well to repeat that this method of double reckoning is visible to every trained observer.

Take three instances as widely apart as A.D. 31-<sup>4</sup> 1522-<sup>5</sup> 1842.<sup>6</sup> In all three cases the same phenomenon is discernible. The

<sup>1</sup> On its antiquity cf. *Anglo-Jewish Cal.* (*supra cit.*). Herwart ab Hohenburg sees *Badhu* embodied in the Jewish *Seder Olam*. *Novæ, Veræ, Exactæ Chron.*, etc., p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> Wurm, *op. cit.* Wurm's tables (1815) have one fatal flaw first detected by Anger, *De Temp in Act. App. Ratione* (1833). They have been continued well into the Christian Era by Beebe of Yale.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Jews* (Eng. trans. by Bella Löwy), II, 581. <sup>4</sup> *Anglo-Jewish Cal.*, *supra cit.*

<sup>5</sup> The mathematician Stöffler selects 67 years out of the sixteenth century and discloses the intercalation which keeps Friday and Passover apart (*Kal. Rom. Mag., Propos.*, XLI; cf. *Propos. ult.*). Stöffler is quite mistaken in supposing that the "secret" is known to Jewish "women and children."

<sup>6</sup> See Lindo, *op. cit.* In these scientific tables covering 64 years, this Spanish Jew, with a reticence not peculiar to him, never gives a hint of the operation of the rule *Badhu*. Yet it is there for all lunar calculators to see.

double reckoning under the working of the secret leaven of *Badhu* keeps the Friday clear of the Passover and throws the feast on to the Sabbath. The moon is incapable of the trick. Only *Badhu* can perform it. There is no *tertium quid*. All that science can do with time is to measure it. The Jewish calendar-makers do more than this with lunar time. They manipulate it for a purpose which they do not acknowledge. The manipulation is as lawful as the astronomical fiction of the "mean moon," but the latter is not a secret. Then why should the former be camouflaged by the Committee appointed from the days of the Sanhedrin<sup>1</sup> onward to frame the calendar of Israel?

## II. EARLY CHRISTIANITY CAUGHT BY THE CAMOUFLAGE

The fourteenth moon of the first sacred month of the Jews gave birth to Christian Quartodecimanism, and the fifteenth moon of the same to Christian Quintodecimanism. If, under the action of the rule of the two "Styles," 14 Nisan = 15 Nisan, it seems to follow that Quartodecimanism = Quintodecimanism. The first equation is met with mirthful scorn by the Jews, who know nothing of *Badhu*; the second is derided by Christian historians, who cannot imagine that their forbears could have battled about two "isms" which differed only in name and were in reality not two but one.

One reason why the study of this most fascinating controversy between East and West is still only in its infancy is the neglect to distinguish between the purely "lunar" Quartodecimanism which had no theological implications and the "liturgical" Quartodecimanism<sup>2</sup> which was finally condemned as "heresy" by the General Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. The condemnation is noteworthy as being the first instance of the liturgical triumph of the West over the East. The "liturgical" Quartodecimans

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> It was condemned because of its alliance with Judaism and its opposition to the Christian legislation prescribing the total severance between the Christian Easter and the Jewish Passover. The best definition of this heresy will be found in St. Epiphanius, *op. om.*, tom. I, p. 420 (ed. Dionysius Petavius, S.J.); and St. Augustine, *op. om.*, tom. X, p. 11 (ed. Benedictines of St. Maur). Strange to say, St. Alphonsus Liguori does not mention Quartodecimanism in his *History of Heresies*.

died hard, and perhaps succeeded in transmitting to the early church of the *Scoti*<sup>1</sup> some of those Judaeo-Johannine principles which led to the prolonged and bitter struggle on the Easter question between the Patricio-Columban *Scoti* and the more Romanized Saxons of England. The pages of S. Bede, "the Venerable," simply kindle with zeal for Roman orthodoxy, not without a *souçon* of anti-Celtic acidity,<sup>2</sup> as he tells the story of the final discomfiture of the Irish champion St. Colman by the Englishman St. Wilfrid at the great theological tourney held at Whitby, Yorkshire. Echoes of the fray lasted a little while, then died out. The mild and non-heretical form of the Quartodecimanism of the *Scoti*<sup>3</sup> left no traces except the soreness caused by the humiliation of the Irish representative at the hands of the merciless English logician, the uncompromising advocate of the right of Petrine Rome to settle the method of determining Easter.

Turning to the Quartodecimans and Quintodecimans of the "lunar" species, we find the temperature of controversy still very high, but the whole *mise-en-scène* different. This most innocent form of Quartodecimanism never came and never could come under ecclesiastical censure. The disputants on both sides concentrated their attention on the day of the month on which our Lord suffered. Was it the fourteenth or the fifteenth? It never occurred to anyone then that either answer would be correct, and so the fight went on indefinitely and vigorously.

The Tübingen school would class the very earliest Asiatic Christians as Quintodecimans. On the other hand Samuel Davidson holds that "the Roman Church maintained that Christ died

<sup>1</sup> The term *Scoti* embraces the Scots of eastern *Scotia* (modern Scotland) and the Scots of western *Scotia* (modern Ireland). The apostle of the latter was St. Patrick, and of the former St. Columba. Bede in his *History* draws no distinction between the two nations, for there was none.

<sup>2</sup> Attempts have been made to prove that the father of English history was free from racial bias. He barely mentions St. Patrick, and his very few references to St. Columba are more slighting than complimentary.

<sup>3</sup> The Celtic church, which, through St. Columbanus (*Epp. Columb. Bib. Max. Pat.*, tom. XII), gloried in its filial attitude to the Petrine See of Rome, was never condemned by Rome for its perfervid attempt to keep to its own Easter, irrespective of the Paschal decree of the Council of Nicaea. On the "Scottish Easter" see the now rare work by the Anglican Bishop Gillan, *The Life of Sage*.

on the 14th."<sup>1</sup> Possibly he is following Duchesne, who writes: "L'église de Rome ne tenait pas moins fermement que les églises d'Asie à la Passion du 14<sup>e</sup>."<sup>2</sup> All these authorities have failed to show how the *volte face* of Asia in passing from Quintodecimanism to Quartodecimanism, and of Europe in passing from Quartodecimanism to Quintodecimanism, could possibly have been effected without leaving a marked impress on ecclesiastical history. All the evidence available goes to prove that from the first, Asia was as Quartodeciman as Europe, on the whole, was the reverse.

In this connection it is impossible to overlook the fact that St. John<sup>3</sup> is on the side of 14 Nisan as the day of the crucifixion.<sup>4</sup> Thus he is necessarily the *fons et origo* of "lunar" Quartodecimanism. Equally necessarily, every Jew since the dawn of Christianity associates himself with St. John. With mingled wrath and mirth the Jews anathematize the view of the Western church that would turn the all-holy Passover of 15 Nisan into a day when a public execution was permitted in the Holy City to the gross defilement of itself and its feast. One of the motives of the hate with which the Jews of Constantinople pursued St. John Chrysostom, was his strong denunciation of the blood-lust which prompted them to forego the sacred duties of the Passover in order to feast their eyes on the awful scene on Golgotha.<sup>5</sup> Surely their predisposition to Quartodecimanism of the kind we are examining is intelligible enough. In the same category must be placed the earliest churches of Asia, which regarded the apostle John as their founder, and also the bulk of the Greek Fathers, always excepting Chrysostom and Euthymius and possibly Epiphanius.

On the side of "lunar" Quintodecimanism, leaving the Greek Fathers out of account, we find the forces of the Latin church

<sup>1</sup> *Introd.*, etc. (1894), II, 463.

<sup>2</sup> *Rev. des. QQ. hist.*, July, 1880.

<sup>3</sup> The question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is not touched on here.

<sup>4</sup> John 19:14.

<sup>5</sup> ἐβλοντο καὶ τὸ πάσχα ἀφεῖναι ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὴν φορικὴν αὐτῶν ἐμπλήσαι ἐπιθυμίαν. Chrys., Hom. in Mt., 58; Migne, *P.G.*, LVIII, 754. A very hard saying. No execution was allowed even on an ordinary Sabbath. Maim. in *Tr. de Synedriis*; Surenhus., *op. cit.*, IV, 226.

intrenched in solid array. The consensus could hardly be more complete. Enough here to refer to the names given by Suarez, Maldonatus, and especially Cardinal Bellarmine.<sup>1</sup> No 'great Western Father or Doctor is missing from the list.

These are the known facts in the controversy, and they contrast with the hypotheses of Tübingen, Davidson, and Duchesne.

The curious thing about the whole quarrel over Nisan 14 and 15 is that, through ignorance of the process of tampering with the so-called lunar calendar of Israel, both the belligerent parties held in perfect good faith that though Friday was assuredly the day of the crucifixion, the two month-days assigned in the Gospels were somehow incompatible. Still more curious is the fact that scholars of the twentieth century take these warriors quite seriously and fancy that there really was something objective to fight about.

In the light of the theory of the double method of reckoning embodied in the rule *Badhu*, there ought to have been no strife, but perfect peace, between the early Christian Quartodecimans and Quintodecimans. If these remarks imply a mild censure on ancient filibusters, what is to be thought of modern critics who still take sides in the struggle, back the dead legions, and incite them to engage afresh in a bogus war?

Both parties were equally in the right. It is as true to say that Christ died on 14 Nisan as to say he died on 15 Nisan. It all depends on the "Style" followed. Truly the wise men of Israel, *in camera* assembled, can afford to chuckle over the gullibility of the *goyim* who cling to the so-called purely lunar calendar of the Jews, and shutting their eyes to the foreign body, called *Badhu*, refuse to see how it works as a camouflage. The device was employed in the death-year of Christ,<sup>2</sup> and Israel does not change. The reason for keeping the Passover off the Friday was as operative then as now. If *Badhu* were once upon a time absolutely foreign to the Jewish calendar, a more momentous revolution can hardly be imagined than the introduction of a brand-new rule tending to the disruption of the whole system of lunar calculations.

<sup>1</sup> *De Euch.* lib. IV, c. 8.

<sup>2</sup> In A.D. 31, when alone all the conditions for the application of *Badhu* were present. So the *Anglo-Jewish Calendar for Every Day in the Gospels*, *supra cit.*

No theorist, however bold, has ever been able to arrive within measurable distance of the date when the alleged revolution came into being. For all we know, it never came in, for it was always there. Had it made its appearance at a given point in Jewish history, the adamantine conservatism of the sticklers for the law would have met it with a protest which would have ejected it summarily. *Badhu* is with us now and will never go out, no matter what light may be thrown on its anti-lunar action.

This part of our subject may be made clearer by an able summing up, free from all chronological technicalities, of the two "Styles" followed by Jesus and the Jewish masses at his last Passover:

Neither did Christ anticipate *His* Passover, nor did the Jews in that particular year postpone *theirs*, in order to carry through the Execution of God.<sup>1</sup> Both He and they kept their respective Passovers at a time which for both parties had long been regarded as lawful. The Lord kept His at the time made lawful by the law of God;<sup>2</sup> the Jews kept theirs at a time made lawful by the tradition of their fathers.<sup>3</sup>

A remarkable feature in this old feud between East and West is that the Christian Quartodecimans, who found their main buttress in St. John, never proceeded to impugn the accuracy, let alone the veracity, of the other biographers of our Lord. The same is true of the attitude of the Quintodecimans, who found themselves in alliance with the Synoptics and apparently at variance with St. John. Some of the wiser medieval commentators, like St. Thomas Aquinas,<sup>4</sup> simply gave the problem up. The great bulk, however, who have bequeathed their methods to a vast number of modern exegetes, tried with might and main to show, either that the first three evangelists were in complete harmony with the favorite St. John, or that St. John was in complete harmony with the favorites SS. Matthew, Mark, and Luke. With the data at their disposal, no victory on either side was possible.

<sup>1</sup> This opinion is very properly antagonistic to that of Chrys., just mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> "Ex lege Dei." It were better to delete "Dei."

<sup>3</sup> *Concord. Evang.* of Jansenius of Ghent (not Jansenius of Ypres), c. 128. Jansenius had probably never heard of the double "Style" nor of *Badhu*, yet he is very near the truth.

<sup>4</sup> Dean Milman (*Hist. Lat. Christ.*) follows the discreet reticence of Aquinas.

The expedients adopted, even before St. Augustine, to secure the coveted "harmony" are a standing monument of those desperate shifts to which men in a "fix" are driven till their efforts betray more of perverse ingenuity than of exegetical honesty.<sup>1</sup>

One thing in the fight between 14 and 15 Nisan was almost universally forgotten, and that was the now unquestioned theory of the supplementary character of St. John. Not that it is a new discovery. Of St. John as a "supplementist" no one has written more finely than St. Epiphanius, who says of him, *προλαμβάνει τῶν ῥηθέντων τὰ μὴ ῥηθέντα*.<sup>2</sup>

Nowadays it is the fashion to say that St. John applies a "corrective" to many statements found in the earlier sketches of the life of Christ. It were truer to say that one of his principal functions is to put right a mistaken interpretation caused or occasioned by those earlier records which were unquestionably under his eye. The Jews have never ceased to chafe under the "libel" popularized among Christians by the written words of the earlier evangelists, who imply that Jesus died on the Passover Day itself. To the intense relief of the aggrieved party, St. John came to the rescue with the explicit declaration that Jesus was crucified, not on the Passover, but on its eve. He never said that his predecessors were wrong in calling the "death-day" the "Passover," or, if they would, "15 Nisan." What he does clearly imply is that the hands of the Jews were unstained with blood on the Passover *as kept that year*. True, the dreadful scene was enacted on a Friday, as St. John and the Synoptics agree; but with their traditional dislike of a Passover-Friday the Jews had shifted the feast and made it into the "high" day<sup>3</sup> marked with the hyphenated sanctity of a Passover-Sabbath. Thus the Synoptics, as there was nothing to correct in them, remain uncorrected and uncensored by St. John. According to *their* legal-lunar reckoning the Master had died on the Passover. All St. John does is to show that the murderous deed was not perpetrated

<sup>1</sup> The exegetical wriggings over 14 and 15 Nisan are almost matched by those over "a third hour," Mark 15:25. It is quite possible that the phrase has nothing to do with the third hour or any other hour *of the day*.

<sup>2</sup> *Hær.* 51. Migne, *P.G.*, XLI, 924.

<sup>3</sup> John 19:31.

on a Friday that was kept as a Passover, but on a Friday whence that distinction was removed to be placed on the Sabbath following.

It is not to be supposed that St. John was under any obligation to enlighten the Quartodecimans and Quintodecimans of the whole Christian Era as to the character of the camouflage that makes *his* Passover-Eve (14 Nisan) identical with the Passover-Day (15 Nisan) of the earlier summarists of the life of Christ. St. John knew what he was writing and knew what the others had written before him. Is it likely that he knew he was in contradiction with them? Anyhow he is not bound to explain how he is in harmony with them. It is for us to find it out as best we may.

### III. THE ALLEGED FRIDAY-PASSOVER IN THE TALMUD

The main reason why the Jews recoiled and still recoil from a Friday-Passover was and is undoubtedly a business one. Such a combination would leave on Jewish shoulders the intolerable burden of two successive days of abstention from servile work and consequent forfeiture or reduction of income or wage. The only way to obviate this financial calamity was to transfer the Passover to the Sabbath, and so leave Friday free for commercial and other lucrative pursuits and thus indirectly enhance the honors of the weekly Sabbath. The practice of the Synagogue in cutting down holy days was one which every business man must commend and no religious man is at liberty to condemn.

When all is said and done, the opponents of the theory of transference fall back on one argument which they seem to regard as unanswerable. The Talmud, say they, far from countenancing the removal of the Passover from the Friday, distinctly recognizes the existence and validity of a Friday-Passover. It should be added that the Talmud, even supposing that it sanctions the combination, gives no indication of the time or the century in which the Friday was so honored in Israel. To try to fix it is a wild speculation. It is urged, without the least attempt at argument, that a Friday-Passover was possible in the time of Christ. Thus He could have died on a Friday-Passover. It is vital to note what follows this admission. It follows (1) that the Synoptics

are probably right, and (2) that St. John, who most assuredly affirms that He did not suffer on the Passover but on its eve, i.e., on 14 Nisan, is hopelessly in error. On the other hand, if we assume that at the Passover of His death there was a true transference of the feast from the legal and lunar Friday-Passover to the Sabbath, it will be seen at a glance and enforced in the sequel that both accounts of the day of His death are strictly accurate.

Now to the question of fact. Does the colossal compilation known as the Talmud anywhere state that the Jews at any period of their history kept their Passover on a Friday?

#### A. THE "LOCUS CLASSICUS" IN THE TALMUD

It is safe to say that only one passage in the Talmud is relevant to the issue. It is found in the tractate *Pesachim* translated by two eminent Latin interpreters, Blasio Ugolino, of Venice,<sup>1</sup> and Wilhelm Surenhuys, of Amsterdam.<sup>2</sup> Here we follow without abridgment the latter version as slightly the better, with some variants from Ugolino, marked "U."

*Pesachim*,<sup>3</sup> VII, 9, 10:<sup>4</sup> Pascha quod exivit<sup>5</sup> aut pollutum est<sup>6</sup> comburatur statim. Si possessores<sup>7</sup> polluti fuerint aut mortui fuerint, transeat forma<sup>8</sup> ejus et comburatur decimo sexto die. R. Johanan filius Berokæ dicit etiam hoc statim comburatur quia non habet comedentes.

Ossa, nervi et reliquæ comburuntur decimo sexto.<sup>9</sup> Si decimus sextus dies inciderit in Sabbatum, comburunt<sup>10</sup> decimo septimo, quia non pellunt<sup>11</sup> Sabbatum neque diem festum.

<sup>1</sup> Ugolino, *Gemara Hieros. Tract. de Pascha: Thes. Antiq. Sacr.*, tom. XVII, p. dcccl.

<sup>2</sup> Surenhus., *Mishnah, De Paschate*, tom. II, pp. 161 ff.

<sup>3</sup> The Hebrew title is a plural, always translated by the Latin singular *Pascha*.

<sup>4</sup> The reference is wrongly given as "*Pes.*, X, 7" by Knabenbauer in *Comm. in Matt.*, II, 414.

<sup>5</sup> "Si Pascha exierit" (U). The best translation is "Quodsi Pascha," etc.

<sup>6</sup> "Pollutum fuerit" (U).

<sup>7</sup> "Si domini," etc. (U). *Domini* and *possessores* mean the same thing, i.e., eaters in possession of a dish.

<sup>8</sup> "Mutetur ejus forma" (U). The original text is obscure but seems to mean that the *unbroken* bones of the lamb were to be heaped up for cremation (Exod. 12:46), thus leaving the lamb unrecognizable as such. Here the Talmudists revel in guesswork about the decomposition of the meat. How could it decompose thus swiftly?

<sup>9</sup> The writer in *Pesachim* has still in view the "Pascha quod exivit," *supra*.

<sup>10</sup> "Comburent" (U).

<sup>11</sup> The subject of the verb is "Judæi." On "pellunt" see *infra*.

The Latin is no more crude or crabbed than the original and gives a good idea of the kind of shorthand notes taken by official scribes at the sessions of the Committee of the Sanhedrin on Rites and Ceremonies. Short as the excerpt is, it faithfully reflects the style of a great part of the Talmud.

#### B. EXAMINATION OF THE PASSAGE IN "PESACHIM"

To deal with a minor point first, perhaps a better rendering than "non pellunt Sabbatum" would be "non propellunt Sabbatum." The technical verb used to denote the "propulsion" or throwing forward of feasts in the sacred calendar of the Jews is *דחף*, "to push" or "shove on."<sup>1</sup> The process is found in vigorous use in the *Megillah*.<sup>2</sup> R. Johanan Beroka, or Berokæ, cleverly extricated himself from a ritual trap by the cry, "Pellatur in diem crastinum."<sup>3</sup> For reasons too intricate to detail, several fasts and feasts were so "propelled." Thus a feast legally due on the eighth of a month might find itself on the ninth, and this without the least attempt at disguise. But to the average Jew a similar treatment of the Passover is unthinkable. Never in Jewish literature is the admission explicitly made that the Passover could be treated with the scant courtesy of "propulsion" or forced to change its sacred signature of the fifteenth day of Nisan. Under the action of transference it will be seen in every Jewish calendar to be subject to aberration or "exit." It strays, it drifts, it slips from the Friday, but it is never strictly "propelled." It may quit its hebdomadal moorings, but, thanks to *Badhu*, never its menstrual place.

This leads us to the first sentence in the foregoing excerpt from *Pesachim*:

"The<sup>4</sup> Passover which has passed out [of its place] or become defiled is to be burnt straightway."

<sup>1</sup> Closely akin to the Catholic method of the "translation" of feasts.

<sup>2</sup> See *De Volumine Esteris*; Surenhus., *Mish.*, tom. II. In this treatise the "anticipation" of feasts is denounced as an abuse, but it could not be kept out. In the Roman ecclesiastical calendar of today signs of this process have appeared.

<sup>3</sup> See Ugol., *op. cit.*, tom. XVIII, p. 808.

<sup>4</sup> The Hebrew article is unfortunately lost in the Latin.

In the Gemara of Jerusalem, as well as in ordinary English, the word "Passover" may stand for the whole of the sacred celebration covering seven or eight days,<sup>1</sup> or for the fare that lay on the table on the night that closed 14 Nisan and ushered in 15 Nisan.<sup>2</sup> Here in *Pesachim*, to judge by the reference to burning, the second meaning is the only possible one. Nor is there any difficulty about the etiology of defilement at the great supper.<sup>3</sup> To touch the heap of bitter herbs or the stacks of unleavened biscuits with unwashed hands and, still more, to ply a soiled wooden *spatula*<sup>4</sup> on the roasted lamb would entail uncleanness on the subject touching and the object touched.

Attention must now be concentrated on the first phrase here translated, "The Passover which has passed out [of its place]," and on the verb in the original נִסַּח, wherein נִסַּח<sup>5</sup> coalesces with the relative.

The efforts of the two great commentators on the Mishnah, RR. de Bartenora and Maimonides, to explain this *crux* leave one under the impression that either they are trying to wrestle with a difficulty which eludes their grasp, or possibly they are

<sup>1</sup> In the light of Jewish tradition it is imperative to introduce the phrase "seven or eight days." *Infra*.

<sup>2</sup> The two meanings of "Passover" will be found in any large dictionary. Cf. *The Standard Dict.* (Funk & Wagnalls Co.). This authority makes the very common mistake of supposing that there was a "sacrifice" of a lamb at the Passover supper. Knabenbauer falls into the same error, *Comm. in Matt.*, II, 425; also Edersheim, *Life and Times*, etc., II, 491. In the days of our Lord every sacrifice proper was consummated at a public altar in the temple by consecrated priests, and never at a private table by a *paterfamilias*. True to his rôle as an allegorical free lance, Philo is most misleading here (*De Vita Mosis*).

<sup>3</sup> The fare was not that of a "banquet." So frugal indeed was it, that long before the time of Christ the ascetic Passover supper necessitated the introduction of the very liberal feast called the *Chagigah*, the Jewish ancestor of the Christian Agape. With extraordinary insight, Maldonatus (*Comm. in Matt.*), the most conscientious of commentators, who had never even heard of this Hebrew name for *festivitas*, sees three distinct meals at the Last Supper: (1) the Passover proper, (2) the *Chagigah*, (3) the Holy Eucharist. The question, which is very large and complicated, has never been fully treated by any critic of any school.

<sup>4</sup> As is well known, no knives or forks were used.

<sup>5</sup> The very word in Gen. 24:50, translated by "proceedeth" in the Authorized and Revised Versions, and in the Vulgate by "egressus est." "Exiit" would do quite as well.

throwing dust in the eyes of the reader in their effort to conceal the surreptitious movement of the supper of the Passover lamb from one day to the next.

The Spanish Jew solves the problem in a very cavalier fashion. The fare that "passed out" (*exiit*) was carried out "extra murum."<sup>1</sup> This is worse than the wildest of schoolboy "shots." De Bartenora, who was well acquainted with *Tosapha*,<sup>2</sup> must have known that it was absolutely forbidden to take any eatable, least of all the lamb, from the Passover table outside the walls of the house. He knew equally well, when engaged in this solemn trifling, that the traditional prohibition was based on Scripture.<sup>3</sup>

If anything, the reputation of Maimonides, in his struggle with this very common Hebrew equivalent for *exiit*, suffers more severely than that of his colleague. His remark is, "Sensus est quod exivit a domicilio in quo comedebatur."<sup>4</sup> The words of Exodus, on which the greatest of Jewish scholars, saluted by his Christian contemporaries as "eruditissimus Judæorum" had commented, are a standing protest against him. "In one house shall it be eaten. Thou shalt not carry forth aught of the flesh abroad out of the house."<sup>5</sup>

The exegesis is so flagrantly bad that a suspicion is aroused that the Talmudists are poking fun at the reader or trading on his ignorance. Petavius, prince of patristic commentators, would take a more serious view. He holds positively that Maimonides was acquainted with the rule *Badhu*<sup>6</sup> and the double reckoning which it necessitated. Is the Jewish scholar afraid to let out some secret bearing on the mysterious *exit* of the Passover feast?

But the Talmudists are not yet done with the simple שֵׁצֵא, (*quod exiit*) of *Pesachim*. It confronts them once again in one of the most occult passages in that treatise.

In some kind of way a limb of the lamb has protruded (*exiit*). The text bristles with difficulties, but the meaning seems to be

<sup>1</sup> Surenhus., *Pes.*, tom. II, p. 161.

<sup>2</sup> See the references to *Tosapha* given by the Hebrew scholar John Lightfoot, *The Temple Service*, *op. om.*, IX, 130; ed. Paton. Lightfoot would reject with scorn the erratic guesswork of de Bartenora.

<sup>3</sup> Exod. 12:46.

<sup>4</sup> Surenhus., *Pes.*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> Exod. 12:46.

<sup>6</sup> *Animadvers. in Epiiph.*, *op. om.*, *Epiiph.*, tom. II, pp. 180 ff.

that one of the legs which were trussed up inside the lamb had forced itself out and caused a "pocket" in the contour of the animal, much as a big raisin pressing against the linen wrap of a plum pudding may spoil the spheroidal shape of the latter. What was to be done with this abnormal "exit" of the leg, if it was a leg? The puerile problem and its fantastic solution—is it not all written in the Gemara? A surgeon commentator might say, "Cut down through the skin and seize and depress the erring *tibia*," but this may or may not be the prescription of the "wise." Not less puerile, but more disingenuous, is the comment by de Bartenora. The "*exiit*," he says, must mean that the animal has somehow got "*extra parietem suum*."<sup>1</sup> It will be remembered that this "explanation" about a "wall" was given when the "*Pascha quod exiit*" was under examination. Now it is the "*membrum quod exiit*." *Risum teneatis amici!* To elucidate his fancy, de Bartenora refers to Exod. 22:30, which only makes matters worse. Here, as often happens with men, semiconscious that they are talking nonsense, the Talmudist seems to lose his temper, and has a fling at "*omnem carnem quæ exierit in campum*."<sup>2</sup> It were sheer waste of time to give the words of Maimonides on the same problem. More prolix and grandiose than those of his fellow-commentator, they are more irrelevant and quaint.<sup>3</sup> The lamb has somehow been caught *flagrante delicto*, doing something outside the "precincts" or in the "field," but what constitutes the offense, or whether it has been committed in life or after death, is not stated.

Enough to say that the treatment by these two illustrious Jews of the simple Hebrew<sup>4</sup> for *exiit* puts them out of court as authorities on the Passover feast that has "quitted" its place.

In extenuation of this critical collapse it may be added that both the "Passover-exit" and the "limb-exit" seem to belong to the very oldest stratum in the Gemara of Jerusalem. Thus Maimonides and his colleague undertook the task of expounding this Sphinx-like riddle much more than a thousand years after the words were written. Maimonides is fond of appealing to "the

<sup>1</sup> Surenhus., *Pes., op. cit.*, tom. II, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> See its use in Gen. 24:50; Exod. 21:34, 23:16; Lev. 25:28; Deut. 14:22; Josh. 15:3, 4, 9, 11; Ps. 19:5 (Authorized Version); Eccles. 7:18.

tradition of the fathers," and he uses this *façon de parler* here again,<sup>1</sup> but there is no trace of any such tradition about either "exit" in Jewish antiquity.

Can it be that the Hebrew verb, rightly translated by *exiit*, refers to the Passover feast as quitting its menological place (15 Nisan), and not the room where it was eaten? The former kind of *exiit* would explain fairly well the speed with which the supper was eaten and the fragments burned.<sup>2</sup> On the hypothesis of transference one can readily understand how the feasters were loth to prolong the interval and thus to accentuate the distinction between the normal-legal Passover and the transferred one.

This, it will be said, is only a conjecture introduced to fill up a marked ellipsis in the Talmud. That is so, but it is also a conjecture which, unlike the exegetical antics of Maimonides and de Bartenora, does no violence to Bible or Gemara or the traditional ritual of the Passover. It fits in with the whole tenor of the passage from *Pesachim* and accounts for the total omission therein of 15 Nisan and the extraordinary stress laid on 16 Nisan though the latter was unquestionably a non-legal day for the cremation of the remains of the lamb.

The very colorlessness of the common Hebrew verb in "Pascha . . . exiit" may perhaps be taken as an indication that a *camouflage*, known or unknown to Maimonides, is being employed in the construction. Again we submit that the Passover feast has quitted its rightful berth, not locally, but menologically. Anyhow the tangled twaddle which so often disfigures the finest pages of the Talmud will not prove helpful in the problem of the *exit* of the Passover.

#### C. THE ALLEGED OPPOSITION OF "PESACHIM" TO THE THEORY OF TRANSFERENCE

There is danger of exaggerating the strength of the alleged opposition of *Pesachim*<sup>3</sup> to the theory of Passover transference from Friday to Sabbath. It has been said above that in every Jewish calendar known to history such transference is invariably practiced, though never avowedly. It does not seem to

<sup>1</sup> Surenhus., *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> "Comburetur statim."—*Pes.*, VII, *supra cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Supra cit.*

matter very much if the opponents of transference in their search for evidence against it have lighted on one short phrase in all Jewish literature where two definite week-days, Sabbath and Sunday, are attached to two definite menstrual signatures, 16 and 17 Nisan.<sup>1</sup> The inference of course is that on this particular occasion the equation Friday = 15 Nisan = Passover is established. Is it?

The case for the opposition would be strengthened if, instead of a curt reference to Ugolino or Surenhuys, as is always given, a tabulated statement of the week-days and month-days involved in the famous passage were drawn up thus:

- (1) Friday, 15 Nisan
- (2) Sabbath, 16 Nisan
- (3) Sunday, 17 Nisan

All is now beautifully simple. *Causa finita est*. The first entry is seen to be the Passover. It is also a Friday. Therefore there is such a combination recognized in the Talmud as a Friday-Passover.

The case is not ended. It is barely opened. Talk of the chronological camouflages of the Old and the New Testament! They are as wisps of gauze compared to the impenetrable disguises which Talmudic figures can assume. When the whole context is carefully scanned, the hasty judgment of the anti-transference critics will probably be reversed.

As has been already intimated, there is no mention whatever in the whole of *Pesachim* of a Friday-Passover. The "Friday, 15 Nisan" of our last table, though quite correct, is an interpolation of our own and does not imply that the Passover was kept on that particular day. It was kept on the Sabbath, the true legal signature for which is 16 Nisan. The proof is simple enough.

The eating of the meat and the burning of the bones took place most certainly on the same night,<sup>2</sup> i.e., the night running into the small hours of the morning. But the remains were burned on 16 Nisan.<sup>3</sup> Therefore the sacred meal was also on 16 Nisan.

<sup>1</sup> *Pes.*, VII, 9, 10.

<sup>2</sup> "Ye shall let nothing [edible] of it remain until the morning, but that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire."—Exod. 12:10. It is quite certain that Jesus and his apostles before leaving the supper-room complied with this law; yet the incident is passed over without a word by a whole host of Christian commentators.

<sup>3</sup> *Pes.*, *ibid.*

Therefore that day was the Passover; that is, the great feast was forcibly excluded from the Friday which fell on the true legal day, the fifteenth. Hence there is no Friday-Passover in *Pesachim*.

Again, the postponement of the cremation from the fifteenth to the sixteenth, whenever the fifteenth fell on a Sabbath, was undoubtedly the rule and a direct derivative from the principle of Sabbath sanctity which forbade the lighting of a fire even in the rabbinical kitchen on the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> Thus the postponement of the cremation was from the sacrosanct Passover-Sabbath to the non-holy Sunday following. Here in *Pesachim* this universal rule is observed, but with this noteworthy feature that the Sabbath, as the *terminus a quo* of the postponement, is explicitly given the signature 16 Nisan and not 15 Nisan. *Had there been a Friday-Passover, kept on 15 Nisan, there would have been no Sabbath motive for deferring the lighting of the fire to Sunday, 17 Nisan.* Hence the postponement recorded in *Pesachim* is not from a Friday-Passover falling on 15 Nisan, but from a Sabbath-Passover falling on 16 Nisan.

To put it in another way: the *terminus a quo* of the postponement of the fire-kindling is always a Sabbath-Passover. But in the excerpt from *Pesachim*, that *terminus a quo* is a Sabbath. Therefore that Sabbath is a Sabbath-Passover. Now that same Sabbath is explicitly said to fall on 16 Nisan. Therefore, the day before, which is unquestionably Friday, 15 Nisan, is *not* the Passover. Hence no Friday-Passover is to be found in the one passage in all Jewish literature, which is cited to prove that the Talmud recognizes such a combination.

Here too, for the first and last time in Jewish documents, the *Badhu*-mask which turns the legal day "Sabbath-Passover, 16 Nisan" into "Sabbath-Passover, 15 Nisan" is not thrust on the face of the sacred calendar. Here the Committee clerks have surreptitiously lifted a corner of the veil to let us see behind the

<sup>1</sup> The point need not be labored; but cf. Burton, *Jew, Gypsy*, etc., p. 80; Zangwill, *Dreamers . . . . Ghetto*, p. 14, and *Children . . . . Ghetto* (one-volume ed.), p. 88; and St. Jerome's joke against the Jews and their *cold* Sabbath dietary in Isa. 65:4. The inference is that on a Sabbath-Passover the *Chagigah* meats (lambs and kids, roasted and boiled) were served cold. Kitchen fires were not forbidden on the Passover as such.

scenes how the sixteenth is the true legal signature, while the fifteenth is the published one. The process is going on today visible to all eyes that are not holden.

The secret of transference has ever been in the keeping of the professional class.<sup>1</sup> Not a word from them about the *modus operandi* which eliminates a Friday-Passover and substitutes a Sabbath-Passover has ever reached the ears of the common herd of Jews or Christians.

The rule of transference is found working out its occult intercalation, first upon Elul (August–September), then upon Hesvan (October–November), all the while effectively securing the noiseless transference of the Passover. The Talmudists shuffled over Elul as their successors do over Hesvan. The former proclaimed that Elul, a *mensis cavus*, always has 29 days; the latter say that Hesvan's quota is similarly restricted. When it is shown to demonstration that these two lunar months are sometimes awarded, against all lunar rules, a thirtieth day, the retort is "Yes, but that thirtieth day is to be regarded in the one case as the Kalends of Tishri, and in the other as the Kalends of Chisleu." It is a transparent subterfuge. The award is made in implicit obedience to *Badhu* and without the knowledge of the masses of Israel.

The remark of Houtingius, a learned collaborator of Surenhusius, is correct but not illuminating: "Authority was granted the Sanhedrin to intercalate, and this for various reasons."<sup>2</sup> It was the Sanhedrin that settled it all. With childlike faith in this august and super-lunar body, de Bartenora writes: "Deputies from the *Sanhedrin* used to go forth to proclaim the time which the *Sanhedrin* had sanctified for the month<sup>3</sup> and the time which it [the Sanhedrin] had fixed for the feast of the Passover."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes three men only were in the secret. *Tr. de Syned.* c. 1. 2; Surenhus., IV, 278.

<sup>2</sup> "Idque varias ob causas." Hout. *ap.* Surenhus., tom. II, p. 317. If he is right in saying that Elul was "raro intercalatus," he might have added that the Talmudists who boasted of the cessation of the operation "from the days of Ezra onwards," had simply transferred their attentions from Elul to Hesvan. Maimonides is very guarded. "Generally speaking Elul has 29 days. . . . It might be that the month Elul should have 30 days." Maim. in *Tr. de Princip. Anni*; Surenhus., *op cit.*, tom. II, p. 315. The learned Jew, Poznański, well known to readers of the *Jewish Quart. Rev.* (ed. C. G. Montefiore), knows nothing of *Badhu*.

<sup>3</sup> I.e., New Moon Day.

<sup>4</sup> *De Volum. Ester.*; Surenhus., tom. II, p. 388.

Maimonides is equally submissive to authority and uses almost identical words.<sup>1</sup>

As before, we turn for enlightenment on the sixteenth and seventeenth days of the Nisan of *Pesachim* to the Talmudic commentators, to be again disappointed.

De Bartenora is content to make the obvious remark that the sixteenth is an "intermedius festi dies," that is, presumably, it falls between the fifteenth and seventeenth. On the same point the absolute silence of Maimonides, considering how long-winded he can be on the most trivial points, is indeed eloquent. Again it may be asked, Is he loath to face a difficulty which might reveal the secret he is resolved not to divulge?

Not less striking than the studied reticence of the Sanhedrin on the transference of the Passover under the rule *Badhu* was the almost universal propagandism of the Jewish conviction that Christ died on a day that was not the Passover, or, as we should say, on a day whence the true legal Passover was transferred.

#### IV. NISAN FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH IN THE "CHRONICON PASCHALE"

This document,<sup>2</sup> as is well known, betrays marked Judaizing tendencies. Its statements on the chronology of the Passover of the crucifixion may be tabulated thus:

Friday, 14 Nisan. Crucifixion. *Eve of Passover of the Jews.*  
 Sabbath, 15 Nisan. Christ in the tomb. *Passover of the Jews.*  
 Sunday, 16 Nisan. Resurrection.

A parallel to the foregoing is found in a little work on the Christian and Jewish Passover by Eutychius, patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>3</sup> Not only did the Jews, for reasons above given, clutch at the *Badhu*-regulated Passover of the Fourth Gospel, but they industriously circulated this form of reckoning in every Christian colony they could influence in Asia and Africa. It matters little whether we call Peter of Alexandria and Apollinaris of Hierapolis "Quartodecimans." One thing is certain about them. In the dates they give from the *Badhu*-ridden calendar of the Jews, they invoke, and rightly invoke, the authority of St. John.

<sup>1</sup> *De Princip. Anni*; Surenhus., tom. II, p. 315.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Du Cange.      <sup>3</sup> Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXVI, 2398.

His *chronotaxis* appears to be identical with the table just given, and his example is a good precedent for the universal acceptance of the *Badhu* reckoning which he chose to follow just as the Synoptics chose to follow the other "Style."

#### V. THE DOUBLE RECKONING OF ST. JOHN AND THE SYNOPTICS

On Thursday, 13 Nisan, according to St. John, and on Thursday, 14 Nisan, according to the Synoptics, our Lord sat down for his Last Supper.

It only remains now to draw up a table showing the relation between the *Badhu*-regulated calendar followed by St. John and the strictly legal-lunar calendar followed by the Synoptics, for three all-important days.

Thursday =	13 Nisan.	Johannine. <sup>1</sup>	<i>With Badhu.</i>
	14 Nisan.	Synoptic.	<i>Without Badhu.</i>
Good Friday =	14 Nisan.	Johannine. <sup>2</sup>	<i>With Badhu.</i>
	15 Nisan.	Synoptic.	<i>Without Badhu.</i>
Saturday =	15 Nisan.	Johannine. <sup>3</sup>	<i>With Badhu.</i>
	16 Nisan.	Synoptic.	<i>Without Badhu.</i>

All that has been attempted in these pages is to use the instrument of the Jewish calendar to open up the main line toward the solution of the "contradiction" in the Gospels. A very rough road it is, and the effort to plane it may be deemed ambitious and pronounced abortive. Still it may be well to make it.

<sup>1</sup> No matter which reckoning we follow, the Thursday of the Last Supper was one of "the days of unleavened bread." Thus the age-long controversy between Greeks and Latins seems to be settled in favor of the latter. On this vital question of the days of abstinence from leaven modern Jews and Christians are responsible for the extraordinary confusion of thought that now prevails.

The learned Lithuanian and ex-Jew Chwolson is grievously mistaken in *Das letzte Passamahl* (*Mém. de l'Acad. des Sciences*, Petrograd), tom. XLI, 1893. The problem has been long since solved. See Maim. in *Pes.*; Surenhus., tom. II, p. 135; Jos. *Ant.* ii. 15. 1; Bell. *Jud.* v. 3. 1; Philo. *op. om.*, p. 293; *Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 5, 17 (ed. Du Cange); St. Thomas Aq., *Summa Theol.*, Pars. III, Q. 46, art. 9, and Q. 74, art. 4; Suarez, *op. om.*, tom. XIX, p. 657 (ed. Berton); Hardouin, *De Ult. Christi Pasch.*, p. 374; Mansi, *Calmet; Dissertat. V. et N.T.*, tom. III, p. 47. How the honors of 15 Nisan were shared by 14 Nisan, "participatione quadam," is clearly shown by Mansi. Even if we say that our Lord began his Last Supper at the close of the Jewish day, 13 Nisan, we must remember that at that very hour he was entering on the new Jewish day of 14 Nisan and had before him nothing but *unleavened* bread.

<sup>2</sup> Implied in John 19:14.

<sup>3</sup> Implied in John 18:28.